

Application S/N 10/750,593
Amendment dated: January 5, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: August 25, 2006

CE11882JEM – Patino, et al.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 16-20 remain pending in the application, as claims 5 and 16 have been canceled without prejudice. In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6, 10-12 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,040,680 to Toya, et al. (Toya). In addition, claims 4, 5, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toya in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0175658 to Watts, et al. (Watts). Claim 6 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toya in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,225 to Goto (Goto). Claims 7, 8, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toya in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,320,354 to Sengupta, et al. (Sengupta). Claims 9 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,057,668 to Chao (Chao) in view of Sengupta. Finally, claim 20 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sengupta in view of Toya.

Independent claims 1, 10 and 19 have been amended to clarify that the battery includes the first charging circuit and provides power to an electronic device, that the electronic device includes the second charging circuit and that the second charging circuit is capable of directing charging current to the battery if charging current is being fed to the electronic device. Support for these amendments can be found in FIGs. 1 and 2 and on page 5, line 8, lines 10-11, lines 15-16 and lines 17-19. No new matter has been added in view of these amendments. Applicants submit that none of the cited prior art references disclose such features. In particular, Toya merely discloses a battery pack that includes a secondary coil and a control circuit for controlling power induced in the secondary coil (see Abstract). Toya simply mentions nothing about a

Application S/N 10/750,593
Amendment dated: January 5, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: August 25, 2006

CE11882JEM – Patino, et al.

second charging circuit being positioned within an electronic device in which the second charging circuit can provide a charging current to the battery pack when the electronic device is receiving a charging current.

Moving to the rejection of claims 9 and 18, admittedly, Chao describes a wireless charging stage that provides charging current to a battery, a sensor in a mobile phone that senses the charging current and that through the sensor, the electronic device is made aware of a parameter (i.e., charging current and voltage) of the battery (see FIGs. 1 and 2 and col. 2, lines 40-44 and col. 3, lines 29-33). Applicants, however, respectfully disagree that one of skill in the art would find it obvious to combine the switching process of Sengupta with Chao. Specifically, the electronic device of Chao (i.e., the mobile phone) already contains a sensor for measuring charging current and voltage in the electronic device. It would be simply superfluous and inefficient to add the Sengupta switching technique to Chao in view of the existence of the Chao sensor.

Concerning the rejection of claim 20, the Examiner has argued that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Sengupta by adding the charging circuit of Toya and the process of its disablement to Sengupta. Applicants note that there is no motivation or suggestion to create such a combination. In particular, Sengupta expressly calls for decreasing the complexity and costs of charging circuits and adding the circuitry of Toya directly contradicts this basic premise of Sengupta. Moreover, Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's notion that "... it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Sengupta system with the Toya system so that damaging overcharge is prevented" (see paragraph 8, page 7 of the Office Action of August 25, 2006). Sengupta is already configured to prevent

Application S/N 10/750,593
Amendment dated: January 5, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: August 25, 2006

CE11882JEM – Patino, et al.

overcharging (see col. 5, lines 66 to col. 6, line 9) and in view of its desire for simplicity, a second overcharge protection circuit is unwarranted.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that independent claims 1, 9, 10 and 18-20 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from these independent claims are now patentable, in view of both their dependence from these claims and their independent patentability. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Moreover, it must be understood that the claims are not limited to the embodiments disclosed in the specification and that the reference numerals of the application that are used in the description above are merely intended to provide clarity to Applicants' arguments.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

Application S/N 10/750,593
Amendment dated: January 5, 2007
Response to Office Action dated: August 25, 2006

CE11882JEM - Patino, et al.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department - MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: 

Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Tel: (954) 723-4295 direct line
Tel: (954) 723-6449 main line
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871